

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

208**CRM-M-18068-2020 (O&M)****Date of decision: 17.08.2020****Raman Rana****.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****....Respondent****CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Girish Agnihotri**

Present: Mr. Vikram Bali, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Sood, Advocate for the complainant.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video
conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court).***********GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner-Raman Rana, stated to be aged 31 years, has filed the present petition under Section 439 Cr. P.C. *inter alia* praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.25 dated 09.05.2019, under Sections 376/506 of IPC, (67 IT Act and Section 201 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Handesra, District SAS Nagar Mohali.

Learned counsel for the petitioner based on pleadings, submits that the allegations in the FIR were that, firstly, the petitioner allegedly was good friend of the complainant. Secondly, the petitioner was unhappy with the complainant on marrying Mr. Kunal Sharma. Thirdly, he allegedly, against her wishes, had developed physical relations again on the date of incident i.e. 13.04.2019. Learned counsel then submits that challan has been presented, there are total of 21 witnesses and none has been examined till date.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Krishan Chand, submits that on the last date of hearing, examination-in-chief of the prosecutrix, has been recorded. He, therefore, submits that at this stage, the petitioner does not deserve concession of regular bail.

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that not only that the three incidents/allegations, against the petitioner, as recorded in the FIR, but even thereafter, the petitioner forwarded the objectionable photographs to father-in-law of the complainant. He then submits that as a result of the above, the complainant's matrimonial life has also been affected. He further submits that the cross-examination of the prosecutrix is yet to be recorded. On the next date of hearing, examination of Pardeep would also be important and material in the present case.

In view of peculiar facts and circumstance of the case as noticed above, this Court does not deem it a fit case, where the petitioner is entitled for grant of concession of regular bail.

The petition stands dismissed accordingly.

(GIRISH AGNIHOTRI)
JUDGE

17.08.2020
 jyoti3

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No